

Questions and Answers

Q1: Consider rewording the Special Standard of Responsibility in a manner similar to previous RFPs (i.e., STARSS I, STARSS II, and TEAMS 2) to allow Offerors who are fully ISO 9001 compliant but not yet “Certified/Registered” to “develop quality system procedures and associated documentation and obtain ISO 9001 certification/Registration within nine months after the contract effective date.” The ISO 9001 certification requirement, as it is written now, limits small business competition as proposals submitted by any companies who are fully ISO 9001 Compliant, but not certified/registered, “will not be considered” and we request that the STARSS III RFP contain language consistent with that found in STARSS I, STARSS II, and TEAMS 2.

A1: The Government considered the ISO 9001 certification during the development of the acquisition strategy and determined that this procurement requires ISO 9001 certification upon receipt of proposals due to the type of work on the contract. The ISO 9001 quality management system requirement has existed for a sufficient period of time such that that companies performing ISO 9001 work on Center at NASA LaRC, are required to be certified.

Q2: We request clarification of the CMMI Level 2 requirements stated in the DRFP. Our interpretation of the CMMI-related wording in the STARSS III DRFP is that only those companies on a team that will actually perform software engineering and processing must be CMMI Level 2 at the time of award. Thus, in a scenario where all software engineering is performed by the major subcontractors, only those subcontractors, and not the Prime, would be required to be at CMMI Level 2 or above.

UPDATED

A2: In accordance with H.13, CAPABILITY MATURITY MODEL INTEGRATION (CMMI) REQUIREMENTS (LaRC 52.246.105) (MAR 2012), the Contractor (including subcontractors) that will be performing software engineering shall have a non-expired rating at CMMI for Development (CMMI-DEV) Maturity Level 2 or higher for software, or Capability Level 2 or higher as measured by a Software Engineering Institute (SEI) authorized lead appraiser from an external organization. The Offeror shall provide proof of a current CMMI for Development Capability Level 2 rating or higher for each entity [Prime and/or subcontractor(s)] that will be engaged in software engineering requiring CMMI DEV-CMMI Level 2. In order to demonstrate this compliance, the offeror shall provide a copy of the rating and Appraisal Disclosure Statement (ADS), which gives the scope and results of a SCAMPI-A appraisal for CMMI-DEV with its proposal.

Q3: Reference DFRP cover page 2, paragraph “b.” which indicates- that Offerors are encouraged to provide evidence of compliance with the CMMI requirements “as soon as possible”, and further states that those who submit the evidence concurrent with the proposal submission run the risk that the documentation may be unacceptable. However, Page 64, paragraph “(iv)” states that Offers shall provide a copy of the certifications and ratings at the time of proposal submission. Please clarify if the

government would prefer that the Offerors submit the certifications and/or other evidence prior to the proposal due date.

A3: The DRFP's cover page 2, paragraph 5 b., states Offerors are encouraged to provide evidence of compliance with the standards listed as soon as possible. This will allow time for Government review and/or request for clarifications and additional information, if needed. Offerors must submit evidence of compliance by the time proposals are due, however, Offerors choosing to submit evidence of compliance for the first time with their proposal at the date and time shown in Block 9 of the SF 33 (face page of the solicitation) do so at the risk that their documentation may be unacceptable and their proposal will not be considered.

The DRFP Section L.13 Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions, paragraph (c) Contract Offer, subparagraph (iv) states that "The Offeror shall provide a copy of the certification (s) and ratings (s) at the time of proposal submission." Therefore, while the Government encourages Offerors to provide evidence as soon as possible, prior to the proposal submission date, to allow for clarifications, a copy of the certification and rating also is required at the time of proposal submission.

Q4: Reference page 82, Section M.3, Subfactor 1 – Please clarify the importance/weighting of Subfactor 1(a) "Staffing and Management" and Subfactor (b) "Organizational OCI & PCI" relative to the 650 points allocated to Subfactor 1. In other words, of the 650 points for Subfactor 1, how many points are allocated to subfactors (a) and (b)?

A4: No points are allocated separately to Subfactor (a) and (b) nor is there a weighting of Subfactors 1(a) Staffing and Management and Subfactor (b) Organizational Conflicts of Interest and Personal Conflicts of Interest.

Q5: Reference Attachment 2 – Staffing Plan – What is the current average productive work year for the incumbent staff (i.e. average hours charged direct to the contract one Full Time Equivalent)?

A5: The Government will not provide the current average productive work year for the incumbent contractor.

Q6: Reference page 64, Section L.13 (d) – Proposal Organization - The Proposal Organization Table includes that a different number of copies are needed of each section of Volume 2 (i.e. Business Proposal: Original + 5 Copies, Responsibility Determination Documents: Original + 3 Copies, Contract Offer: Original + 1 Copy). Is it the government's intent that Volume 2 be provided as three sub-Volumes in order to be consistent with the number of copies required?

In addition, Section L.13 (c) indicates that the ISO 9001-2008 certification and proof of CMMI for

Development Capability Level 2 should be provided in the Contract Offer section while Section L.15 indicates they should be in the Responsibility Determination Documents section.

Please clarify what content is required in each section of Volume 2 and the number of copies of Volume 2 that are to be provided.

A6: The Government does not intend for the Offeror to submit three sub-Volumes of Volume 2. Section L.13 (d) will be revised to increase the number of copies from 3 to 5 for the Responsibility Determination Documents and to require only the original Contract Offer.

Also, Section L.13, c) Contract Offer, paragraph, 2(iv) will be deleted in its entirety. Offerors shall abide by the instructions in Section L.13(c).

Q7: Section L.13, d), 2, page 65 – Figure/Table Font Size Question - Is Arial 10pt. font acceptable for Figure Captions and Tables?

A7: No, the Government requires Arial 11 font for all text throughout all volumes to include graphs, graphics, charts, tables, and figure captions.

Q8: L.16 Factor 2, page 69 – Cost/Price Question - Per Form 3-WYEs & Labor Rates there are 278-276 WYEs on the contract. Per G.5 of the draft contract there will be office space provided at the government facility for 155 personnel. Should bidder assume 121-123 WYEs are to be bid as Offsite (housed at contractor facility) and for which categories?

UPDATED

A8: The Government will provide office space for up to 155 personnel of the 271-273 WYEs on the contract. The Offeror shall propose where the remaining personnel will be located and the labor categories of the offsite personnel. The labor categories of the personnel currently on-site/off-site is contained in is found in the Bidder's Resource File entitled (STARSSII_Historial_Staffing_Onsite-offsite_20150629.xlsx).

Q9: L.16 Factor 2, page 69 – Cost/Price Question - Form excel columns C, f, I, L and O has a title "Allocation Base 5". Should the title be "hours" to correspond with column R?

UPDATED

A9: Columns C, F, I, L, and O (in Cost Form 2) are for direct labor hours, the allocation bases for indirect costs, and the base for fixed fee.

Column R (in Cost Form 2) is simply the total hours for each proposed labor category (i.e. across the entire period of performance).

Columns C, F, I, L, and O (in Cost Form 2) entitled "Allocation Base" incorrectly references footnote [5]. The correct footnote for these columns is [6]. Below the table in Cost Form 2, the Footnote 6 reads:

“(6) Show the hours for each proposed labor category and the allocation base for each indirect cost element and fee.”

The Government will revise the title and superscript of columns C, F, I, L, and O in Cost Form 2, from “Allocation Base ⁵” to “Labor Hours or Allocation Base ⁶”.

Q10: L.16 Factor 2, page 69 – Cost/Price Question - Per Form 1-Total Price Summary worksheet there is a row for “IDIQ – CLIN 3”. Are bidders to complete a price the IDIQ portion of the contract? If so, will worksheets be provided in the RFP?

A10: Offerors are simply required to propose the IDIQ amounts that are already included in Form 1: \$12M per year, \$60M in total. Also, please see the paragraph entitled “Form 1” under Sec. L.16(b)(1), which states: “Form 1 – Total Price Summary: This form is completely self-calculating. Offerors shall not make changes to Form 1. If proposed, the Phase-In price is part of the Total Proposed Price.”

Q11: L.16 Factor 2, page 69 – Cost/Price Question - Per L.16 c) Subcontractors may submit proprietary cost data directly to NASA. Should significant subcontractors submit Form 3 or Form 4 to NASA? Form 3 includes indirect rate detail, Form 4 does not.

A11: Form 3 does not include indirect rate detail. It includes the RFP specified labor categories, WYEs, and average direct labor rates. The only part of Form 3 to be completed by Offerors (and significant subcontractors) is cell B7: productive work year.

As it pertains to significant subcontractors, Form 4 would be for the significant sub’s subcontractor(s) (if proposed) (i.e. second tier subcontractors).

The Government will revise DRFP Section L.16(c)(1)

The DRFP states that significant subcontractors must submit a proposal in accordance with DRFP Section L.16 of the solicitation (i.e. must complete and submit all Forms). The Government will revise L.16(c)(1) to read as follows:

“1) Each significant subcontractor, as defined in L.6, shall be supported with a separate cost proposal that complies with all cost/pricing instructions of this solicitation, except for the following:

Subcontractors shall not propose the IDIQ amounts listed in Form 1 [\$12M per year].
Subcontractors shall not propose the ODC amounts listed in Form 2 [\$1.5M per year].
Subcontractors shall not complete Form 6, Verification of Limitations on Subcontracting.

If not included in the Offeror’s proposal (i.e. due to proprietary cost data), each significant subcontractor shall submit its cost proposal directly to NASA no later than the date and time specified in the instructions for receipt of offers for this solicitation. The price(s) presented in the Offeror’s proposal for the subcontracted effort(s) will be

considered the intended price(s). If applicable, the Offeror shall explain any differences between the subcontractor total proposed price and that proposed by the prime Offeror. The Offeror shall provide sufficient information to support their determination of price/cost reasonableness of subcontractor proposed costs (see FAR 15.404-3, Subcontract pricing considerations)."

Q12: Introduction, page 2 – Size Standard Issue: We request that the small business size standard selected for the STARSS-III procurement be reviewed. While the NAICS code 541712, Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences, is applicable, the invocation of an exception to the base size standard of 500 is not warranted. The preponderance of work for this contract, as described in the Draft RFP and RFI, as well as the preponderance of work on the existing STARSS-II contract, is atmospheric science, atmospheric science instrument development and atmospheric science data processing. Very little, if any, of the work is properly described by the allowed exceptions to this size standard. We therefore request that the exception be removed and the base size standard of 500 employees for NAICS 541712 be applied to this procurement.

A12: The Government reviewed the small business size standard selected and determined NAICS Code 541712 and small business size standard of 1,000 employees is appropriate for this procurement. This procurement requires an in-depth knowledge of spacecraft and launch vehicles in order to accommodate science payloads. It also requires translation of research objectives and scientific requirements into viable instruments concepts for ground-, aircraft-, and space-based atmospheric research applications. This procurement will support current and future space instruments/experiments launched on space vehicles (i.e., SAGE III, CERES, RBI, CALIPSO, and CLARREO). Furthermore, this contract will support space qualifications of instruments including but not limited to vibration, thermal, and vacuum tests.

Q13: L.17 – Past Performance Proposal – Volume III, Factor 3, pages 73 & 74 and M.2 Evaluation Factors, Factor 3 – Past Performance, pages 80 & 81: Would the government please clarify and expand upon the requirement and evaluation process for past performance, specifically in regards to the \$10M annual obligations threshold? The DRFP indicates that a prime contractor citing three \$10M contracts would receive a "somewhat pertinent" score, which translates to a "low level of confidence" for size relevancy as described in Section M. This appears to be overly constraining for small business concerns. Furthermore, the DRFP does not indicate what is required to achieve any higher level of confidence for size relevancy.

A13: The SEB will conduct the past performance evaluation in accordance with FAR 15.305 and NFS 1815.305. The SEB will assign one confidence rating for the Past Performance proposal. A prime contractor whose largest reference contract is \$10M/year in obligations will be assigned a "somewhat pertinent" for "size." However "size" is only one component of past performance, therefore an offeror assigned a "somewhat pertinent" for size would not on its own translate to a "low level of

confidence” for past performance. The evaluation conducted is an evaluation of pertinence (recent (past 3 years), of size, content and complexity) for the proposal team (prime and significant subcontractors) and performance, which results in an overall Level of Confidence rating.

The DRFP specified dollar values for the Prime (at least one of the three contracts with \$10M in obligations per year) and each significant subcontractor (at least one of the three contracts with \$3M in obligations per year) to clearly notify interested offerors of the “size” of contract that would be considered “somewhat pertinent” (using the confidence definitions set forth in NFS 1815.305 and the RFP). The \$10M annual obligation threshold is roughly 20% of the current annual obligations on the contract.

No further thresholds will be specified.

The Government will revise the first paragraph of L.17a) to read as follows:

“a) Proposal Content – The offeror shall include a list of the three most relevant contracts that the prime as well as each significant subcontractor have on-going or completed within the past three (3) years for requirements that are similar in size in dollars per year, content, and complexity to the requirements of this solicitation (including Federal, State, and local Government and private contracts). For the prime offeror, to be considered at least “somewhat pertinent” in size, at least one of the three contracts being submitted for consideration shall be at least \$10 million in average annual dollar obligations.”

For a significant subcontractor, to be considered at least “somewhat pertinent” in size, at least one of the three contracts being submitted for consideration shall be at least \$3 million in average annual dollar obligations. It is the responsibility of the offeror to clearly and completely demonstrate in its proposal the relevancy of each of the prior contracts offered in terms of size, content (by Statement of Work area specified in 11) below and complexity to the current procurement. For each contract identified, include: ”

The Government will revise the third paragraph of M.2 Factor 3 – PAST PERFORMANCE to read as follows:

“For the purpose of determining size relevance, the Government will compare the size of work performed for the referenced contracts to the total price proposed for CLIN 2. To be considered at least “somewhat pertinent” in size, at least one of the three contracts being submitted for consideration shall be at least \$10 million in average annual dollar obligations. The confidence rating assigned to Past Performance will reflect consideration of information contained in the proposal; past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires, and data NASA obtains from other sources. Offerors without a record of relevant past performance, or for whom information on past performance is not available, shall receive a neutral rating.”

Q14: Section L, paragraph FACTOR 1 – MISSION SUITABILITY states “The Offeror shall identify and discuss 5 of the most significant programmatic risks for each subfactor and the approach to avoid, neutralize or mitigate such risks, during contract performance as set forth in NFS1815.305, Proposal evaluation.” Are we correct to assume that a total of 10 risks are to be presented, i.e., five for each subfactor?

A14: Yes, the Government requires five (5) risks for each of the two (2) subfactors.

Q15: FACTOR 3 – PAST PERFORMANCE Content Guidelines Subparagraph a) states “The Offeror shall include a list of the firms that will submit past performance questionnaires along with the written consent of each proposed significant subcontractor to allow NASA to discuss the subcontractors' past performance with the Offeror.” Question: Would it be permissible to exclude the consent letters from page count?

A15: The Government will amend the RFP to exclude the consent letters from the past performance volume page count.

Q16: L.13 PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS, subparagraph d), item 2. states “The Offeror shall use Arial 11 font in its proposal (all volumes). Line spacing or the amount of vertical space between lines of text shall not be less than a single line (Microsoft Word’s default line spacing). Character spacing shall be “normal” and not “expanded” or “condensed”. Question: Would it be permissible to use a smaller font such as Arial Narrow 9 or 10 pt?

A16: See A7.

Q17: SOW Section 3.2 Electronic Contract Management System states” The Government will provide a commercial-off-the-shelf Electronic Contract Management System (ECMS) implemented as a web based ordering system. Question: Has the Government selected the product? If so, please disclose the name of the product.

A17: The Government has not yet selected the commercial-off-the-shelf Electronic Contract Management System (ECMS).

Q18: L.16 FACTOR 2 – COST/PRICE, c) Significant Subcontractor Proposal Information:

Question: Is it permissible for the prospective prime contractor to exclusively propose hours for itself and its significant subcontractors and require its significant subcontractors to only include rates and rate data in their sealed packages?

A18: See A11.

Q19: G.5 INSTALLATION-ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNMENT PROPERTY, (C):
Question: Will the Government provide computers and ancillary IT equipment to support

the 155 on-site personnel? If not, should Offerors assume that costs for this equipment will be accommodated from the \$1.5 million annual ODC budget?

A19: Please see DRFP Section H.10 Government Furnished Information Technology (IT) Services (LaRC 52.245-7) (June 2012), this clause specifies that NASA LaRC will furnish all necessary computers and related information technology services that will be connected to the NASA network infrastructure for all on-site contractors.

Q20: G.6 LIST OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY FURNISHED PURSUANT TO FAR 52.245-1:

This Offeror notes that computers and peripheral equipment are not included in Exhibit C, Off-site Government Furnished Property. Will the Government make computers and peripheral equipment available to off-site contractor personnel? If not, should Offerors assume that costs for this equipment will be accommodated from the \$1.5 million annual ODC budget?

A20: The Government will not provide computers and peripheral equipment to off-site contractor personnel. The costs for this equipment are not accommodated from the \$1.5 million annual ODC amount.

The Government will modify DRFP Section L.16(f)(1) as follows:

"1) For proposal purposes, the Offeror shall propose all the ODC amounts set forth in Form 2: \$1.5M per year. These amounts are for material, equipment, and travel, but do not include off-site facility costs. The Offeror shall provide support and rationale for off-site facility costs. Off-site facility costs include but are not limited to facility lease/rental, computers, and peripheral equipment. The Offeror shall specify if these costs are, according to the Offeror's established accounting policies and practices, considered direct or indirect and propose these costs accordingly. The Offeror shall apply applicable burden rates to these proposed ODC amounts [or costs]. The Offeror shall not propose ODCs in addition to those specified in Form 2 and, if applicable, the off-site facility costs."

Q21: Will the Govt. consider changing the font from Arial to Times New Roman?

A21: See A7.

Q22: Can the Govt. clarify what the font size should be in Tables, Graphics, etc.? Typically for text within tables, and especially graphics, it is common for text font size to be 10 pt. Graphics with text font size larger than 10 pt are often overwhelmed by the dominance of the text size, particularly in process flows.

A22: See A7.

Q23: On page 75 of the Draft RFP, in Section L.17(b), it states: "The offeror is requested to return the completed past performance questionnaires no later than the

timeframe specified in L.13(b), Proposal Submission Information to the email address or fax number provided on the questionnaire." This presents 2 questions: 1) The Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) states that the respondents (Contracting Officer and COTR) should submit directly to Contracting Specialist, however the direction above says the offeror should return the PPQ by the date specified. Can NASA please clarify whether the offeror or the respondent is to submit directly to Tameka Woodley? 2) The timeframe specified in L.13(b).2 references that the Past Performance Volume itself is due on July 21, 2015, by 2 p.m. However, the notional date for the other volumes in the proposal is August 6, at 2 p.m. Are PPQs due back to Ms. Woodley at the same time as the Past Performance volume or the date of the remaining volumes (notionally August 6)?

A23: The Government requires that the PPQ be returned directly by the respondent (customer) to the Contract Specialist, Tameka Woodley. PPQ's are requested to be submitted at the same time as the Past Performance Volumes, on 7/31/2015.

The Government will revise L.13(b)2 to read as follows:

"The offeror is requested to submit the Past Performance volume of the proposal on or before 2:00 p.m. local time, July 31, 2015. The Past Performance Questionnaires should be submitted by the respondent (customer) on or before 2:00 p.m. local time, July 31, 2015." Additionally, the Government will revise pg. 1 of the PPQ by removing the due date field and pg. 6 of the PPQ by removing the Contracting Officer and naming the Contract Specialist."

Q24: Exhibit A, 4.7, p.30 – Will the Govt. please provide a list of all software, hardware and the current architecture in use in the ASDC?

A24: The Government provided this information in the Pre-Solicitation Conference charts (slides 31-32) conducted on 6/23/15. The Government will also upload this information to the Bidder's Resource file in the file entitled "ASDC Technologies 20150501.xlsx".

Q25: Exhibit A, 4.7, p.30 – Does the government envision a system (software and/or hardware) refresh of ASDC over the life of STARSS 3? What systems or components are targeted?

A25: The Government anticipates that most ASDC hardware, software, and technology will be refreshed during the STARSS III contract period.

Q26: Exhibit A, 4.7.3.2, p.33 – Would the Govt. provide Standard Operating Procedures and the data management plan for the ASDC (e.g., configuration management)?

A26: The ASDC does not have Standard Operating Procedures documented; therefore, the Government cannot provide this document.

Q27: Attachment 5 and Exhibit B – There is conflicting information in Attachment 5 and Exhibit B. On page 1 of Attachment 5, the first paragraph states: "The Offeror shall submit a detailed safety and health plan with Volume II of its proposal" However, on page 4, (sub-section titled: "H. Safety and Health Plan) of Exhibit B, it states: "The Contractor shall submit a Safety and Health Plan within 30 calendar days of contract effective date." Can the Government please clarify whether a Safety and Health Plan is to be submitted with the proposal or if it will be due 30 days after contract award? There are currently no instructions or details about a Safety and Health Plan in Section L of the proposal.

A27: The Safety and Health Plan shall be submitted with the proposal. The Government will add the Safety and Health Plan requirements to Section L.15(c) to read as follows:

"3. Safety and Health Plan - The offeror shall address the approach to safety and health as required by NFS 1852.223-70, Safety and Health. The offeror shall submit a Safety and Health Plan in accordance with NFS 1852.223-73, Safety and Health Plan. This plan will be incorporated in any resulting contract."

Additionally, the Government will revise Section H of Exhibit B to read as follows:

"The Offeror shall submit a detailed safety and health plan with Volume II of its proposal showing how it intends to protect the life, health, and well-being of the public, NASA, and Contractor employees, as well as property and equipment in accordance with the format and requirements of Appendix E of NPR 8715.3, NASA General Safety Program Requirements."

Q28: Attachment A, section 3.2 – How is the contractor expected to interface with the GFE ECMS: read-only, manual data input, or via an upload from a contractor system to the Government system? If the latter, will the Government supply an ICD as an appendix to the RFP?

A28: The Government has not yet selected the commercial-off-the-shelf Electronic Contract Management System (ECMS). A list of the minimum ECMS requirements is available for your reference in the Bidder's Resource File entitled "LCMS-Requirements.xlsx". No, the Government will not supply an ICD as an appendix to the RFP; however, an ICD will be supplied at contract award.

Q29: Attachment A, section 3.2 – Does the Government system export reports and other information for use by the contractor? If so, will the Government supply an ICD as an appendix to the RFP?

A29: See A28.

Q30: Attachment A, section 3.2 – Will the Government supply a comprehensive list of the functions performed by the GFE system (e.g., labor allocation by task, schedule

management at the task level, cost estimation, and tracking, cost and schedule variance reports, etc.)?)

A30: The Government is not able to provide a complete list of functions at this time. The Government will provide this information once the ECMS is procured. See A28 for a list of the minimum requirements for ECMS.

Q31: Attachment A, section 3.1 – Will the Government provide a recent Annual Work Plan (AWP) so that we know the exact nature and level of detail of the content?

A31: STARSS II does not have an AWP; therefore, the Government cannot provide an AWP.

Q32: Section 4.6.3, p.28 – The Govt. requires compliance with LaRC's proposal process. In order to comply with the requirements, will the Govt. consider supplying the proposal process?

A32: Yes, the Government will provide both the LMS CP-1340 and LPR 7510.1 via the Bidder's Resource File. LMS CP-1340 governs the Science Directorate's ROSES proposal preparation, review and approval. Proposal efforts outside of ROSES are governed by LPR 7510.1, which is managed by the NASA LaRC Office of Strategic Analysis, Communications and Business Development (OSACB). Efforts outside of the scope of these directives are managed by the sponsoring Product Unit.

Q33: L17.a, section a – Would the Govt. clarify the wording in L.17.a where it states: "The offeror shall include a list of the three most relevant contracts that the prime as well as each significant subcontractor have on-going or completed within the past three (3) years" Given that this is a Small Business Procurement, competition could be severely limited if the requirement is for three contracts from the prime to use as Past Performance citations. Would the Govt. consider re-wording to: "The offeror shall include up to three of the most relevant contracts that the prime as well as each significant subcontractor have on-going or completed within the past three (3) years...."?

A33: The requirement of the solicitation will remain unchanged. While this is a Small Business Set-Aside, requesting a list of the three most relevant contracts is considered appropriate considering the STARSS III solicitation is a large dollar, complex procurement for vital support services for the Science Directorate at NASA Langley Research Center.

Q34: What are the current FTE's and Labor Categories in the ASDC?

A34: The current WYE and Labor Categories for all SOW areas are provided in the Bidder's Resource File entitled "STARSSII_Historical_Staffing_150514.pdf".